Application No. Applicant(s) 10/585.481 NOMLIBA ET AL Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit GELEK W. TOPGYAL 2481 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) . (1) GELEK W. TOPGYAL. (4)_____. (2) DOUGLAS HAHM. Date of Interview: 20 September 2011. □ Telephonic □ Video Conference Type: Personal [copy given to: applicant applicant's representative ⊠ N∩ If Yes, brief description: . Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☐103 ☐Others (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion) Claim(s) discussed: 1,26 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: NA.

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include; identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The examiner presented applicants with proposed examiners amendment to include limitations of dependent claims 2-5 into independent claims 1, 26 and 27 (thereby cancelling claims 2-5 as well). Additionally, amendment was proposed to overcome 101 rejection of claim 27. The applicants accepted the proposed examiners amendment in the telephone conversation on September 20°, 2011. The accepted amendment is as recited in the attached Notice of Allowance.

Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation include the interview should include the interview institution in the substance of programmer and interview of the interview of the interview of the interview of the premark institution of any other perintent matters discussed argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other perintent matters discussed argument programmer institution of any other perintent matters discussed and premark institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed and the institution of any other perintent matters discussed any other perintent matters discussed any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discussed and the institution of any other perintent matter discu

goriota rocalio di catcomo di cio interveni, to indiado a	ar maisans as to mission or not agreement
☐ Attachment	

/WILLIAM C. VAUGHN JR/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2481

/GELEK W TOPGYAL/ Examiner, Art Unit 2481 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413R (Rev. 8/11/2010)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20110928